

## REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Advisory Action, Applicant amends the Application and seeks consideration thereof. Applicant amends claims 1, 22, 24 and 26 and cancels claims 8 and 9. Applicant does not add any new claims. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 10-13, 15-22, 24 and 26-27 are pending.

To render a claim obvious, the combined references must teach or suggest each of the elements of the claim. Among other elements, amended claim 1 defines a method of displaying an image comprising transmitting a first portion of video image data from a video controller, without transmitting a remaining portion of the first video image data, and a second portion of video image data from a video controller, without transmitting a remaining portion of the second video image data, over a bus to a first video memory contained within a first display device and a second video memory contained within a second display device. Applicant respectfully submits the combination of Salesky and Ohshima fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of claim 1.

Applicant notes some of the elements amended into independent claim 1 were incorporated from cancelled claim 8. Thus, reference will be made to the Examiner's grounds for rejection of claim 8 in the context of amended claim 1.

In making the rejection, the Examiner asserts claim 1 (and claim 8) is obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 B1 issued to Salesky et al. ("Salesky") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,945 issued to Ohshima ("Ohshima"). The Examiner cites Salesky for teaching transmitting a first and second portion of video data to a first and second display device and Ohshima as teaching "a display apparatus with partially rewritten line determination means including the use of SBus (26) for connection purposes" for teaching the use of a bus. See Paper No. 16, page 2 (citing Ohshima Col. 12, lines 1-46, 34-44 and Figure 4A) and page 4 (citing Ohshima, Figure 2). Applicant respectfully submits the cited sections of Salesky and Ohshima fails to teach or suggest transmitting a first and second portion of video image data from a video controller over a bus to a first and second video memory contained within a first and second display device, respectively.

Referring to Figure 2 of Ohshima, Figure 2 shows graphic controller (27) connected to frame buffer (13), local memory (28) and FLC display (15). Graphic controller (27) may send and receive data to and from frame buffer (13) and/or local memory (28), however frame buffer (13) and local memory (28) are not video memories of FLC display (15) since Figure 2 shows frame buffer (13) and local memory (28) as separate and distinct from FLC display (15). Moreover, Figure 2 shows the data sent from graphic controller (27) goes directly to FLC display (15), not to a video memory of FLC display (15). Applicant respectfully submits the data sent to FLC display (15) is simply displayed and cannot be sent to any memory since there is no teaching or suggestion that FLC display (15) contains any memory. Therefore, Figure 2 of Ohshima fails to teach or suggest transmitting a first portion of video image data over a bus to a first video memory contained within a first display device since FLC display (15) does not include a first video memory.

The Examiner does not cite Salesky as teaching or suggesting transmitting a first and second portion of first and second video image data from a video controller over a bus to a first and second video memory contained within a first and second display device, respectively. In addition, Applicant in reviewing Salesky cannot discern any sections of Salesky that teach or suggest such elements. Therefore, the combination of Salesky and Ohshima fails to teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1.

For the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is not obvious over Salesky in view of Ohshima. The failure of the combination of Salesky and Ohshima to teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 is fatal to the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 5, and 10-13 each depend from claim 1 and contain all the elements thereof. Therefore, at least for the same reasons as claim 1, claims 2-3, 5, and 10-13 are not obvious over Salesky in view of Ohshima. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3, 5, and 10-13.

In addition, claim 2 further recites the elements of “refreshing a first displayed image in the first display device from the first video memory.” The Examiner alleges Ohshima “discloses X

client (30) with respect to X server (31) to determine the line to which partial writing should be applied and transfers such information to the remote firmware (35)” to read on these elements of claim 2. Paper No. 16, page 3 (citing Ohshima Figure 3 and Col. 3, lines 22-28. Again, Ohshima fails to teach or suggest that the first video memory is contained in the first display device. In addition, in reviewing the cited section, Applicant is unable to find any teaching or suggestion that the display is being refreshed, let alone being refreshed from the first video memory, which is contained within the first display device. Applicant respectfully submits that this section teaches updating an image, which is different than refreshing an image since refreshing an image entails, at times, sending/displaying the same image multiple times consecutively, while updating an image generally means sending/displaying a new/different image or new/different portion of an image only once. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits each of the elements of claim 2 are not taught or suggested by the cited references and again respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3 and 5, the Examiner claims Salesky “teaches flow control between presenter client (12) and between server (14) and attendee client (18) determining how often the attendee client receives information updating the image.” Paper No. 16, page 3 (citing Salesky Col. 8, lines 3-10). The cited section teaches that the control flow “depends on the characteristics and configurations of the clients, the server, and the network.” Salesky, Col. 8, lines 6-8. Applicant does not see where this section teaches or suggests transmitting a first portion of video data at regular intervals as recited in claim 3, nor does Applicant see where this section teaches video data being sent at irregular intervals based on detecting a change in the first video image as recited in claim 5. Applicants points out that the Examiner is suggesting that this section shows both regular and irregular intervals, when there is no reference to data being sent at any interval at all. Rather, this section shows that the control flow is dependent on the participants of the conference. Applicant respectfully submits that the language of this section 1) does not teach or suggest regular or irregular intervals of data being sent, and 2) “control flow” is far too ambiguous to support a contention that one skilled in the art would read this section as teaching or suggesting

such. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits each of the elements of claims 3 and 5 are not taught or suggested by the cited references and again respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 5.

Regarding amended claim 22, among other elements, claim 22 defines a system comprising a bus coupled to a video controller, a first video memory contained within a first display device and a second video memory contained within a second display device to update a first image displayed by the first display device and a second image displayed by the second display device by transmitting over the bus to the first and second video memories video data that has changed since a previous update similar to claim 1. Therefore, the discussion above regarding a combination of Salesky and Ohshima failing to teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 is equally application to claim 22. Thus, claim 22 is not obvious over Salesky in view of Ohshima. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22.

Claims 15-21, 24, and 26-27 each depend from claim 22 and contain all the elements thereof. Therefore, claims 15-21, 24, and 26-27 are not obvious over Salesky in view of Ohshima. At least for the same reasons as claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-21, 24, and 26-27.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/23, 2004

*Thomas Coester*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas M. Coester  
Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 23, 2004.

*Nadya Gordon* 1/23/04  
Nadya Gordon Date